



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

131

1)

CRM-M-63729-2025  
Decided on : 17.03.2026

Ajay Masih @ Ajay @ Prince . . . Petitioner(s)  
Versus  
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

2)

CRM-M-69729-2025

Deepak @ Sunny @ Chichar @ Deepak Singh . . . Petitioner(s)  
Versus  
State of Punjab . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Neeraj Yadav, Advocate,  
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-63729-2025).  
  
Mr. Angel Walia, Advocate  
for the petitioner(s) (in CRM-M-69729-2025).  
  
Mr. Jasdeep Singh, Addl. AG, Punjab.  
\*\*\*\*\*

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. This order shall dispose of CRM-M-63729-2025 & CRM-M-69729-2025, as both the petitions are interconnected and have arisen out of same FIR. However, the lead case is CRM-M-63729-2025.
2. The instant petitions have been filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023 (earlier Section 439 Cr.P.C.), for grant of regular bail to the petitioners, during the pendency of trial, who have been booked in a criminal case arising out of First Information Report, as detailed here-under:-

| Name of Petitioner(s)                                      | FIR No. | Date       | Section(s)                                                | Police Station | District                                  |
|------------------------------------------------------------|---------|------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Ajay Masih @ Ajay @ Prince (petitioner in CRM-M-63729-2025 | 217     | 17.07.2023 | 302, 406 of IPC, 1860 [S. 201, 34 of IPC, added later on] | Sadar Amritsar | District Police Commissionerate, Amritsar |
| Deepak @                                                   | 217     | 17.07.2023 | 302, 406 of IPC, 1860                                     | Sadar          | Amritsar                                  |

|                                                             |     |  |  |                                     |  |  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| Sunny Chichar Deepak Singh (petitioner in CRM-M-69729-2025) | @ @ |  |  | [S. 201, 34 of IPC, added later on] |  |  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|

3. The name of the deceased in the present case is Gulshan Singh Sodhi. The FIR was registered at the instance of his daughter – Anarika Singh, which reads as under:-

*“Statement of Anarika Singh w/o Gaurav r/o H. No.70, Friends Colony, Patel Chowk Division NO.2 Pathankot age about 37 years M.No. 7087088507. it is stated that I am resident of above said address and I got married with Gaurav in 2009. We are two sisters. I am the elder one and my younger sister Anjori is residing in Nirwana Green, 4 Kharar. We have 2 brothers and the elder one is Mayank Sodhi and the younger one is Ashairwad Sodhi and both of them are residing in Bombay and they are not in contact with both of us and our father Gulshan Singh Sodhi from last 12/13 years. My mother Amarpreet Kaur got divorced from my father in March 2009 and because of that my father Gulshan Singh Sodhi aged 67 years, son of Pritam Singh is residing alone in H.No.6148, Street No.3, Indra Colony Opp. Govt. Hospital Mustafabad, Amritsar and he is suffering from Cancer from last about 1-1/2 year and is getting treatment from Homy Baba Cancer Hospital, Mullapur, District Mohali and we had kept Rajkaur wife of Satnam Singh r/o Street No.6 Indra Colony Mustafabad to take care of him and to took food for him. Since my father was not keeping good health so both of us (sisters) kept on enquiring about his health and today my father was to go to Homi Baba Cancer Hospital Mullanpur for getting Chemo and my sister Anjori had a talk with him on phone and my father told us that he had received a payment of Rs.2 lakhs for the house which he had sold. Today at about 10.30AM I received a telephonic call from Vattan Sodhi son of Gurwinder Singh Sodhi r/o Street No.3 Indra Colony Mustafabad Amritsar who is son of my Bhua who informed that today Raj Kaur came to the house of our father and when she entered. the house after opening the outer gate and found that our father Gulshan Singh Sodhi was lying dead on the bed covered in pool of blood and all the articles in the room were lying scattered. On this information he had gone and saw that all the articles in the house and in the almirah were lying scattered. I immediately alongwith my husband Gaurav son of Baldev Raj started for our house at Pathankot and have reached the spot where I saw the dead body of my father in lying in with an on his head and the bed*

*was covered with his blood and all the articles were lying scattered. His black colour brief case in which he used to keep gold articles, cash and property documents was missing and even the DVR of the cameras were also missing and I will inform you later on about that after enquiring the same. Some unknown persons entered the house of my father in the night and have taken away the brief case containing cash, DVR etc. I have given the statement which is correct. Legal action be taken against the accused.”*

4. During the course of investigation, one witness, namely Gurwinder Singh, was joined, who stated that he had seen the accused persons near the place of occurrence on the fateful day and had also overheard their conversation. Another witness, namely Hardeep Singh, also got his statement recorded to the effect that he had overheard a conversation of the accused persons to the effect that since the deceased had recently received money on account of sale of some property, he could be an easy target.

Thus, prosecution alleges that after joining the aforesaid witnesses in the investigation, all the accused persons, namely (i) Ajay Masih @ Ajay @ Prince, (ii) Deepak @ Sunny @ Chichar @ Deepak Singh, (iii) Lovepreet Singh @ Kalta, and (iv) Kewal Masih @ Sunny, were arrested in the case. Two of the accused, namely (i) Lovepreet Singh @ Kalta and (ii) Kewal Masih @ Sunny, have already been granted the concession of regular bail by the Coordinate Benches of this Court vide orders dated 23.09.2024 passed in CRM-M-33112-2024 (Annexure P-2) and 09.07.2025 passed in CRM-M-260-2025 (Annexure P-3), respectively.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that as per the prosecution version, based upon the disclosure statements, the allegation is that the present petitioners, namely (i) Deepak @ Sunny @ Chichar @ Deepak Singh and (ii) Ajay Masih @ Ajay @ Prince, had entered the house of the deceased and, after committing his murder, had also committed theft of

his mobile phone and some money. It is submitted that the other co-accused, who were not alleged to have entered the house, have already been granted bail.

It is further submitted that the prosecution relies upon the statements of two witnesses, namely (i) Gurwinder Singh and (ii) Hardeep Singh. Out of these, Gurwinder Singh has already appeared in the witness-box and has deposed regarding having lastly seen the accused near the place of occurrence. However, the second witness, namely Hardeep Singh, who allegedly overheard the conversation, has turned hostile while appearing before the learned trial Court.

It is further argued that there is no substantive admissible evidence against the petitioners. Both the petitioners are in custody for more than 02 years and 07 months and out of the total 26 prosecution witnesses cited, only 04 witnesses have been examined so far. Therefore, they cannot be detained in custody for an indefinite period.

So far as the recovery is concerned, an amount of Rs.9,000/- has been recovered from petitioner – Ajay Masih @ Ajay @ Prince, whereas an amount of Rs.15,000/- has been recovered from petitioner – Deepak @ Sunny @ Chichar @ Deepak Singh.

6. On the other hand, learned State counsel, while opposing the prayer for bail, submits that the allegations against the petitioners are serious in nature, as they pertain to the commission of an offence under Section 302 IPC. It is contended that as per the prosecution version, the petitioners had entered the house of the deceased and committed his murder, followed by theft of certain articles. It is also submitted that the recovery of cash amount has been effected from the petitioners in pursuance of their disclosure statements.

However, learned State counsel does not dispute the factual aspects noticed here-above, particularly the period of custody undergone by the petitioners, the fact that one of the material witnesses, namely Hardeep Singh, has turned hostile, and that two of the co-accused have already been granted the concession of regular bail by the Coordinate Benches of this Court.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the relevant material available on record.

8. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, it is noticed that the petitioners are in custody for more than a period of 02 years and 07 months. Out of the total 26 prosecution witnesses cited, only 04 witnesses have been examined so far, and thus, the trial of the case is likely to take considerable time to conclude. It is further not disputed that one of the material witnesses, namely Hardeep Singh, has already turned hostile, whereas the testimony of the other witness, namely Gurwinder Singh, is limited to the aspect of last seen near the place of occurrence.

It is also a matter of record that two of the co-accused, namely Lovepreet Singh @ Kalta and Kewal Masih @ Sunny, have already been granted the concession of regular bail by the Coordinate Benches of this Court and, therefore, petitioners also seek the benefit of parity. The recoveries effected from the petitioners are also of a limited nature.

9. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, and without commenting upon the merits of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioners deserve the concession of regular bail.

Consequently, prayer made in the present petitions are **allowed**.

Petitioners are ordered to be released on bail, subject to their furnishing bail/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court/ Chief Judicial

Magistrate/ Illaqa Magistrate/ Duty Magistrate concerned, if not required in any other case.

10. Needless to observe that the petitioners shall not extend any threat and shall not influence any prosecution witness in any manner directly or indirectly.

11. The observation made here-in-above shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the facts of the case and the Trial Court is expected to decide the case on the basis of complete evidence available on record.

12. **Petitions stand disposed of.**

Pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

Photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)**  
**JUDGE**

**March 17, 2026**

*J.Ram*

*Whether speaking/reasoned:*      *Yes/No*

*Whether Reportable:*              *Yes/No*